

**New York Tribune**  
First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.  
FRIDAY, JULY 21, 1916.  
Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, 150 Nassau street, New York.  
Subscription Rates:—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:  
Daily & Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.75; 3 mos. \$5.00; 6 mos. \$9.00; 1 year \$16.00.  
Daily & Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.50; 3 mos. \$4.50; 6 mos. \$8.00; 1 year \$14.00.  
Sunday only, 6 mos. \$4.00; 1 year \$7.00.  
Foreign Rates:—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:  
Daily & Sunday, 1 mo. \$2.50; 3 mos. \$7.50; 6 mos. \$12.00; 1 year \$22.00.  
Daily & Sunday, 1 mo. \$2.00; 3 mos. \$6.00; 6 mos. \$10.00; 1 year \$18.00.  
Sunday only, 6 mos. \$5.00; 1 year \$9.00.  
Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

**The British Blacklist.**

American opinion is very intolerant of blacklists and boycotts. It believes that the use of such weapons is always mean-spirited and cowardly. Our laws and our courts have put a ban on the secondary boycott—a form of proscription which strikes over the head of an opponent at innocent bystanders having nothing to do with the cause of the quarrel. They have also forbidden the use of the written or published blacklist intended to intimidate third parties from dealing with one or other of two groups engaged in economic war.

The natural instincts of our people have therefore been outraged by the publication of the British government's list of American citizens or of alien citizens and corporations domiciled here with whom British subjects are forbidden to trade. This proclamation is a fresh challenge to our government to resent the unusual and extra-legal measures which Great Britain has taken to control and stifle neutral commerce. It is a most impolitic challenge. The British government has been enforcing a secret boycott against most of these individuals and firms. So long as it was secret our government could not take notice of it. London should have left well alone.

At best, the effect of a boycott on trade in which neutrals supposed to be favorably disposed to Germany are engaged can be little more than a pin prick. Yet for the trivial satisfaction of placarding these few individuals and firms Great Britain risks incurring the ill-will of the American public and invites reprisals—injuries alike to us and to her—which would only move the Teutonic allies to loud guffaws. The game is never worth the candle in boycotting and blacklisting enterprises. Our domestic boycotters learned that lesson long ago. Great Britain will learn it to her sorrow if she persists in trying to put a few individuals and firms in this country out of business at the cost of commercial hostilities with the United States.

We do not deny the right of the British government to say that its subjects shall not deal with the persons on the official blacklist. That result was, in fact, already practically attained before the blacklist was published. The proscribed individuals and firms have now no trade worth speaking about with Great Britain's enemies.

But if the direct boycott is to be converted into a secondary boycott, the United States will have to take some action in self-defense. If American vessels were to be discriminated against because they carried to neutral countries goods offered by boycotted individuals or firms, our government would be forced to interfere. We could not tolerate such a limitation put upon our shipping under no other warrant than that of British municipal legislation—of a proclamation which, according to the British government's own explanation, is intended to be purely domestic in its effect.

If a blacklisted American citizen, for instance, wants to send merchandise in an American vessel to South America, the British government has no right under any law to try to discipline, then or later, the shipmaster who accepts such legitimate cargo.

The United States cannot stand for the secondary boycott on the high seas any more than it can stand for the secondary boycott at home. The most sensible thing Mr. Asquith's government could do under the circumstances would be to withdraw its foolish and futile blacklist.

**Matty and the U. S. A.**

Matty was far more than the greatest of pitchers. He was a hero, an idol and a tradition, all in his lifetime. He was our sacred elephant, our local K. of K. and Phœbus Apollo rolled into one. Strong men who had seen him vied with small boys who had not in worshipping him like a totem pole. His departure marks the end of a religious dynasty and the beginning of new deities.

Just now when the great minds of the country are debating ways and means of pulling the country together such a central figure of adoration starts an interesting line of thought. Matty, one-old-cat and the integration of America are by no means such unrelated topics as the first glance suggests. Perhaps the public schools should come first. Next to them we place baseball, with all the world contents, as the great welder of America into unity, that and nothing less. To get the process at its liveliest you must take a trip to the back lot or the playground street and see the welding when the metal is most malleable. But the integration continues on the bleachers, even if more slowly. Vicarious sport may not do much for lungs and colons and livers; it works great things toward mutual understanding and univer-

sally small talk and general consciousness of kind, in the lingo of sociology. Any batting order tells the story. When Coveleskie pitches to McKee and Shawkey to Nunamaker and you have Heilmann, Kavanagh, Peckinpach, Baumann, Oldring and Magee in the field you feel as if there ought to be a scoring column, between runs and hits, for assisting integrated America. The individuals are nothing. It is the back-lot baseball they represent that counts—and that, thank heavens! continues without aid from reformers or legislators and despite all that great cities can do to make play a crime.

**Philippine Blunders.**

Elsewhere on this page we publish a letter from ex-Judge James C. Jenkins on conditions in the Philippines. Judge Jenkins served for eleven years on the bench of the Philippines Court of First Instance. He has had ample opportunity, through travel and association with all classes of Filipino population, to study at first hand the problems of American trusteeship in our Far Eastern dependency.

Mr. Jenkins's record on the bench attests his high personal and professional reputation. Fifty-three criminal cases tried by him were appealed to the Philippine Supreme Court. His decision was reversed in only five of them. In thirty-one civil appeals there was not a single reversal. His opinions are therefore those of a man entirely competent to pass judgment on the political needs of the Philippines and the wisdom or non-wisdom of the administration which they have enjoyed under the present Governor General. Judge Jenkins's verdict on the latter point is anything but favorable. He tells frankly what is wrong with the Wilson-Harrison policies. What he says naturally agrees with the testimony of the other Americans once resident in the islands who have given most time, thought and energy to the working out of the Philippine problem. Not scuttles, not light-minded encouragement of the ambitions of the Filipino politicians who are anxious to take control of the islands out of our hands, but a serious, patient, generous development of the capacities of the people, in their own interest and in fulfillment of the mission which the United States assumed in 1899 and which it is bound in honor to carry through. That is the one conception of our duty in the Philippines on which all the broad-minded of the Americans who have seen service in the archipelago earnestly and heartily agree.

**Arbitration the One Way Out.**

The conference between the garment manufacturers and workers failed to develop a basis for agreement, but it abundantly established the one outstanding fact of the whole struggle—that arbitration is the only hope of either temporary or permanent peace. The wrangle in which the conference ended leaves the disputed points in doubt. Apparently the supposed crux of the disagreement, the preferential union shop, was satisfactorily solved. The break came over lesser demands. The truth is that after months of bitter struggle face to face parleys offer little hope of compromise.

The appeal to President Wilson is a wise step, and the grave national ramifications of the lock-out afford abundant reason for federal investigation. The citizens of New York should not forget, however, that the issue and responsibility rest primarily upon their shoulders. The manufacturers seek to jettison the progress of twenty years. They would send us back to the brutal hardships and industrial chaos that prevailed before collective bargaining came into being. No American community can afford to let such retrogressive ideas prevail.

Arbitration must be urged upon the manufacturers by every voice of influence. Pending their acceptance of the inevitable, the citizens of New York must make the cause of the starving workers their cause. Much money has already been given. More should follow. The city must make it clear for all time that to attack modern methods of settling labor disputes is to attack the welfare of the whole community.

**The Clinic at Sing Sing.**

The establishment by the Rockefeller Foundation of a psychopathic clinic at Sing Sing prison provides the scientific equipment which the cause of prison reform has long needed. Society's treatment of the convict has been left largely to sentiment, good intentions, guesswork, tradition and the trade unionism of that class of officials to whom the public has thoughtlessly delegated the apprehension and punishment of the criminal. We shall learn now whether there is a "criminal class" and why it is that the methods of reform or restraint which succeed best with some persons fail notably with others.

It is the easiest thing in the world to generalize about "the criminal class" or any other group of individuals to which we personally do not happen to belong. There has been no little nonsense, brutality and bathos arising from the habit of regarding all criminals alike as demons, idiots or fallen angels. There are those who hold Lombroso's theory that all criminals are physical and moral degenerates, to be dealt with accordingly. There are those who take the attitude of the older officialism, that criminals are all wilful wrongdoers, toward whom society has no other responsibility than to deal out such punishment as rigid impersonal justice requires. There are those who hold the sentimental view that every criminal, a good man at heart, whom misfortune has made the victim of our cruel law is only waiting for some one to treat him with kindness and trust to be led back to the path of virtue. There are those, economic determinists, who argue that as man is only the product of his environment, all any criminal needs to make him a good citizen is a fair industrial opportunity.

A psychopathic clinic will dispel such preconceived ideas, each of which at best

only applies to a small portion of our prison population. It will doubtless be found that there are as many mental and moral types inside prison walls as outside, and that in dealing with them in prison, as elsewhere, one man's meat is another man's poison. Most intelligent people to-day are ready to abandon the antiquated beliefs, according to which a prison was a place where a vindictive principle of justice must be satisfied by suffering, in favor of the modern view that the chief function of such an institution is to restore men to useful citizenship.

The prison problem is now simply one of finding the most effective methods. No single method may be applied to all alike. The processes by which normal minded men may be restored to social relationships may only work harm among the mentally defective. If psychiatry can do what the law at present fails to do—correctly segregate the incorrigibles for special treatment—it will accomplish the first step toward placing penology on a rational basis.

**Small Beer for Teetotallers.**

Hitherto the board responsible for the regulation of the liquor traffic in Great Britain has been engaged chiefly in making the way of the drinking man harder. It was as a war measure that the board was created, and the results of restriction have been, upon the whole, so beneficial that the tendency of those in control has been toward extending the system rather than relaxing any of the rules. Now, however, a new order has been issued, the object of which is "to give extended facilities for the sale of light beer containing not more than 2 per cent of proof spirit." That is to say, taverns in the scheduled areas may stay open all day for the sale of such beer; the regulations restricting the sale of stronger drinks will not apply to them.

This is an interesting experiment and a sensible one. The out-and-out teetotallers will probably object to it, but more on account of the name given to the beverage than for any reasonable cause. Absurdly enough, it has hitherto been allowable to sell such beer, regardless of the war restrictions, provided it was not made more than 2 per cent alcohol it was not technically "intoxicating liquor," unless it happened to come from some place engaged in the production of stronger beers or ales. This anomalous distinction is now done away with, and small beer is small beer wherever it comes from.

The injustice of objecting to the use of such a beverage is apparent when it is considered that many of the so-called temperance drinks are no less potent. Ciders and ginger beers are often more intoxicating, and to tolerate them while objecting to very light beers is pedantic, if not insincere. The difficulty for many who are in the habit of drinking with their meals is not to do without their accustomed allowance of alcohol, but to find a palatable non-intoxicating beverage. Most of the temperance drinks are sweet and unpleasant to one who is used to beer. If a thoroughly innocuous beer has really been found it should prove highly popular. And a beer containing no more than 2 per cent of proof spirit is pretty safe: the toper will get no farther with it.

At least we hope the sharks will not interfere with our ancient and honorable friend the sea serpent's summer rounds.

**The Army Reorganization Farce.**

The new army legislation is a farce. It is worse than a farce. It is a positive disgrace to a body of lawmakers presumed to be blessed with common sense.

Men joined the National Guard in no expectation of being sent out of their respective states. Suddenly they find themselves subject to the call of the government, and away they go, leaving by the thousands women and children unprotected.

It is all wrong. Men with dependent families have no business to be on the border. There is no such crisis as to require a general uprising of the unarmed militia that one William Jennings Bryan was going to raise in a fight for the defense of the country. Every militiaman who has left behind him women and children who must rely upon private contributions should be relieved from duty and sent home. It isn't the duty of the individual citizen to support dependent families. It is the duty of Congress to organize armies at the expense of the nation.

**A Universal Language.**

When the high representatives of the Allied Powers held their recent conference in Paris, those present—representing Great Britain, France, Russia, Italy, Japan and Portugal—did their business in English. A generation ago that would hardly have been possible; no British delegates would have ventured to suggest it. Probably French would have been the medium of discussion, if any common medium could have been found. A few centuries ago representatives of leading countries meeting under such circumstances would have held their conference in the Latin.

The vast expanse of the British colonial empire, the growing multitude of Americans and Britons who travel in foreign lands, the zeal of our missionaries, the melting pot process of this country and its effect on the great number of aliens who return to their native lands, the spread of British and American trade—these are some of the influences that are making English the international language in statecraft and diplomacy as well as in traffic and travel. Even Japan, which takes itself on its conservatism and isolation, is teaching English in schools. The students of Waseda University recently had public exercises in which they delivered addresses and performed a play in English—and the auditors understood!

If the spread of English is but half as great in the next generation as it has been in the last, the field of opportunity for those who are laboriously trying to promote this so-called "universal" language will be narrowed to the vanishing point.

**KEEPING AUTHORS FREE**

**Affiliation with the A. F. of L. Would Not Limit Independence of Speech.**

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: Your correspondent, Mr. Robert J. Shores, has been misinformed as to the terms upon which it is proposed to affiliate the Authors' League of America with the American Federation of Labor. It is impossible for the authors to lose their independence of speech and action. The American Federation of Labor has expressly stated that it has no desire whatsoever to exercise any censorship over the written or spoken opinions of the authors. And, needless to say, this would be explicitly stipulated in the articles of affiliation before they were signed.

Mr. Shores surely will realize that if the unions sought to do anything so idiotic as to suppress criticism of themselves they could have gone a long way toward doing it in the newspapers. "Bix Six" is admittedly the strongest of all the unions. But you have still to hear of a union compositor objecting to setting up articles that criticized the unions.

Mr. Shores evidently does not know that the keenest critics of unionism as a politico-economic principle and of the conduct of particular unions are to be found in the ranks of union labor. Nobody pretends that it is a perfect instrument. But it is the most practical means for securing a certain measure of economic justice that has yet been discovered.

Authors are not independent workers—except the few for whose writings there is such a popular demand that they can dictate their own terms. As it is, there are even now many of them, fairly well known men, who have had to put up with unfair and dishonest treatment and have been unable to resent it in a practical way. Surely it is obvious that a boycott by the authors of any given publisher or cinema producer would be vastly more effective if they were backed up by the allied unions.

The Authors' League's committee on affiliation has not recommended this step without taking the most competent legal advice. The majority of us were originally as strongly opposed to the proposition as Mr. Shores. We investigated it from every angle. We have cross-examined the officials of the American Federation of Labor with the utmost thoroughness, to make sure that our independence of thought and action might not be jeopardized.

The results of our investigation are at the disposal of every member of the league or anybody else who might be indirectly affected—for there is no doubt that this is a matter which concerns the public almost as much as it does the authors.

LOUIS SHERWIN.  
New York, July 19, 1916.

**Labor's Opposition to Copyright.**

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: A committee of the Authors' League of America has, in a recent report, formally recommended to the members of the league that it will be desirable for the Authors' League to come into affiliation with the American Federation of Labor.

It specifies as one of the more important of the advantages which, in the opinion of the committee, will be secured through such affiliation, the service that the Federation of Labor will be able to give to the league in its negotiations for contracts in the publishing, the magazine and the theatrical business.

The committee states that the adjustment of any differences that might arise with moving picture producers, theatrical managers, publishers and others would be very much furthered by the active support of the unions, comprising 2,500 members in all, constituting the Federation. The report goes on to say "the particular union whose cooperation was desired could then aid us in any way it might see fit, even to the extent of a strike." That is to say, the authors, who should be the intellectual leaders of the community, are, it seems, prepared to follow the example of organized labor. They propose that issues in which they are concerned shall be adjusted not on the merits of the case, but under the pressure of outside influences, and, when convenient, by the use of outside violence.

The principal charge against the labor unions of this country is that, in place of endeavoring to bring about an adjustment of the issues based upon the conditions of the market and the possibilities of the market, and arrived at through an unrestricted interchange of views, they insist upon bringing in the element of force. They take the ground that unless their views shall be accepted no other laborers shall be permitted to carry on the work. The authors, in looking forward to adjusting by these means issues connected with literary property, are giving their practical approval to the principles and the methods which have governed the actions of the labor unions in the country.

A second possible advantage specified by the committee is that its affiliation with organized labor will "help the League in its endeavor to secure universal copyright and to put the United States in the International Copyright League, thereby automatically securing world-wide copyright protection for any matter copyrighted in America." If the members of this special committee had taken the pains to consult the chairman of its own copyright committee, who has direct knowledge of the history of copyright legislation in this country, they would have been informed that the only obstacle that stood in the way of the acceptance by the United States of the Berne Convention was the opposition of the organized unions. It is the policy of the Federation of Labor that each union should work in behalf of any undertaking that the other unions have in train, and it was in this way that when the American typographical unions took the position that the United States must accept not a world-wide but a restricted copyright, with conditions which were connected with the copyright law of no other country, it was able, through the cooperation of the affiliated unions, to bring sufficient pressure to bear upon Congress to secure the acceptance of its views against the contentions submitted on behalf of the authors, artists, composers and publishers.

In the face of this history, it is, to say the least, rather absurd to assume that the Federation of Labor could be made serviceable in securing for the United States a civilized copyright system and the acceptance of a world-wide copyright.

GEORGE HAVEN PUTNAM,  
Chairman, Copyright Committee, Authors' League of America.  
New York, July 19, 1916.

**Gun or Broomstick?**

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: I am in possession of a letter from a friend of mine who is serving with the 1st Cavalry, Troop A, on the border. In this letter the soldier states that he has been on patrol duty without ammunition and that his gun might as well have been a broomstick.



**BLUNDERS IN THE PHILIPPINES**

A Former Member of the Philippine Judiciary Points Out Some of the Errors in Policy Which Have Caused the Failure of the Harrison Administration—Partisan Politics Has Controlled the New Governor General, to the Undoing of the Good Achieved by His Predecessors.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: It was fortunate for the Filipinos that the Clarke amendment to the Jones bill did not pass.

It was also fortunate for the United States, because it would have placed us in an embarrassing position. The scuttling policy will never do. Having put our hands to the plough, we cannot now turn back. We cannot honorably let go these islands till they are able to stand alone—till their people can properly govern themselves. That time is in the far distant future.

We are bound by moral and treaty obligations to hold on, to guide and protect them till they are able to protect, guide and govern themselves. Indeed, abandonment would be in bad faith, and would reflect lasting discredit upon us as a nation. It would be said that we did not remain in control for fear we would ultimately be driven out by Japan or some other foreign power; that we had ignored our obligations, failed to meet them, or were afraid to try to meet them.

Do the Filipinos want independence? Some of them do; the great majority really do not. The politicians (political bosses) desire "independence" because they want office and a return to the conditions of the Spanish regime—with the Spaniards eliminated. They have everything to gain and little to lose.

They have been able to lure the more ignorant natives into the belief that independence means much that it does not mean. These natives are led to believe that independence means absolute freedom, unbridled liberty, the right to do as they please without legal restraint; while it really means oppression and slavery for them, worse than under Spanish sovereignty.

The more ignorant scarcely know what liberty under the law is or the necessity for law and order. They don't fully understand the need of any rule of civil conduct.

They act like mere children and can be easily gulled—easily led to their own destruction. And the politicians play upon this credulity and willingness to follow.

I have repeatedly told the Filipinos that in my opinion they would never have independence, because it would not be given them till they were capacitated for self-control, self-help and self-government; till there was commercial and industrial independence; and that when this came about they would be wise enough to see that it was not best for them, and that possibly they would then be admitted into the Union. Many of the best informed would be highly pleased to remain indefinitely a dependency or with ultimate standstill in view.

The sensible farmers and successful business men, who think and act for themselves and know what is best for them, are perfectly satisfied with the status quo, and would come out boldly and say so if they did not fear the political bosses. They dare not speak their minds freely for fear that shortly there would be independence, and then the politicians would make it hot for them.

But these sensible business men and farmers know that their lives, liberty and property are much safer under the rule of Uncle Sam. They don't have to be told that. They know that government by their own people would be a failure—would increase the burdens of taxation and lessen the protection of life, liberty and property. They fully realize that in the administration of justice there would be largely a miscarriage.

Nearly every sensible business man or farmer prefers to have his case tried before an American judge. He knows his rights are safer if an American adjudicates them, and the intelligent, honest lawyers tell them so. It is a fact indisputable that the average intelligent litigant prefers an American judge.

This brings me to one of the greatest of Governor Harrison's mistakes (and they are numerous). The reorganization of the courts in the early part of 1914 was an egregious blunder. It greatly lessened the efficiency of the judiciary; and Mr. Harrison

could have prevented it if he had wanted to do so. But he wanted to reassign the old judges and appoint a half dozen new ones to suit Speaker Osmena and a few young lawyers of Manila. Confidence in the judiciary has thus been largely destroyed.

Before this reorganization act was passed there were approximately twenty-four judges of first instance and six land court judges—thirty in all.

This act abolished the land court, enlarged the jurisdiction of first instance courts, and provided for thirty-six judges instead of thirty, with a decrease of salaries so as to make the aggregate of salaries paid about the same as before. But there was really no necessity for a greater number of judges, as they were already sufficient in number, intelligence and industry to dispose of the business, and in a much more efficient and satisfactory manner. This act also included the unprecedented provision that after reaching sixty-five years of age a judge must retire without pay or pension, no matter how long he had been on the bench or how good a record he had made.

Mr. Harrison (a young man of forty summers) must have concluded that only young men are capable. One might suspect, however, that it was done in order to get rid of the American judges of experience, who had long ago been appointed by such learned and able lawyers as Mr. Taft, General Luke Wright and Judge H. C. Ide, predecessors of Mr. Harrison. In 1904 the native and American judges were about equal in number. Now the proportion is two to one in favor of the natives.

It was Mr. Harrison's misfortune when he first landed in the Philippines that he knew nothing of conditions there. He received advice from unreliable and unworthy sources, instead of from experienced, well informed men like Mr. Taft, Hon. Dean Worcester, General Luke Wright, Judge Ide, Judge Gilbert, ex-Governor Forbes and others, who could and would have given him good sound advice if he had been willing to receive it or sought it. But Mr. Harrison seemed to have spurned it and sought counsel from improper sources, resulting in deplorable mistakes and maladministration.

None of his predecessors had allowed politics to play any part in the selection of government officials. This cannot be said of Mr. Harrison. He publicly proclaimed that he was a Democrat before reaching the Philippine shores, and his Democracy could not down. It was allowed to assert itself wherever possible. A careful analysis of his appointments would clearly demonstrate his partisanship. Mr. Harrison is not sufficiently broad-minded to be other than a partisan. He is a good fellow socially, but a young man, and, it is said, an ardent Tammanyite.

What about business conditions? Since the first publication in Manila of the Staunton speech of President Wilson, in December, 1913, business in the islands has been at a standstill. Yes, paralyzed, and largely destroyed. The Americans in the islands are demoralized, distrustful and disheartened; the Filipinos made to feel that the bottom rail would soon be on top, and it has been placed there, with as little reason and good sense as when the blacks in South Carolina and Mississippi were allowed to take the reins of government just after the Civil War.

If the Harrison policy is the Wilson policy, then Mr. Wilson has practically undone the good that has been done in the islands by his predecessors.

It is this independence of the serious injustice done to the numerous faithful and highly efficient American public servants in the Philippines who have been removed from office or their resignations forced without any good or sufficient cause. Many of them had been so long in the foreign service and so far from the homeland as to put them entirely out of touch with their relatives and friends and business affairs, and some of them too old to renew life's struggle in their native land, never having even suspected that they would be thrown out of employment in the government service if they made good.

This was a gross outrage and reflects infinitely discredit upon the Harrison or Wilson Administration, or both, and has been seriously detrimental to the public service in the Philippine Islands. If this policy is to be followed in future it will be extremely difficult to get good and efficient men to accept public office in these far-away possessions.

When Mr. Shuster said recently that the islands were never in better condition or better governed than now he must have intended a huge joke. They were in far better condition when Mr. Shuster was a member of the Philippine Commission, six years ago. I know that there never has been a worse government than the present one during the twelve years that I have been there.

If Mr. Wilson is made to shoulder the responsibility of the maladministration in the Philippines it will suffice in itself to condemn his Administration, without regard to his watching and waiting policy or any of the other shortcomings, blunders and stupidities of his theoretical, psychological, non-practical, non-active and inefficient administration of the affairs of the United States.

In his "Constitutional Government" Professor Wilson said: "We cannot give them [the Filipinos] self-government; self-government is not a thing that can be given to any people, because it is a form of character and not a form of constitution. No people can be given the self-control of maturity. Only a long apprenticeship of obedience can secure them the precious possession, a thing no more to be bought than given."

He believed this at the time he wrote. Why, then, was there a complete change in such a short time? He endorsed the Baltimore platform, yet he ignored it when it suited his purpose. Why did he, even before inauguration, in the Staunton speech, express the hope that the frontiers of the United States would soon be contracted, resulting at once in serious disturbance to the business, peace and prosperity of the Philippine Archipelago? Did he not then know that his language would be construed, by both natives and Americans, to mean that he was in favor of immediate independence? And why did he follow this up by sending a young man without knowledge of Philippine affairs and conditions out to these islands to execute his mandates and to make radical changes in governmental policy, machinery and operations, with no assurance whatever of the wisdom of so doing?

Was he simply playing politics? Did he pursue such a course because he thought it would be popular in the United States and help to reflect him? Or was it merely the offspring of downright stupidity? Or was it prompted by violent partisanship—a disposition to nullify the work of prior Republican administrations without regard to the character of the work or the good that had been accomplished? Mr. Wilson is enigmatical.

JAMES C. JENKINS.  
New York, July 20, 1916.

**Workmen's Compensation in the Senate.**

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: After three and one-half years of persistent work by the American Association for Labor Legislation, on July 12 the House of Representatives in Washington passed, by the practically unanimous vote of 286 to 3, the Kern-McGillivuddy workmen's compensation bill for injured Federal employees. It is now pending in the Senate.

This was one of the measures to which the Democratic party pledged itself in 1912. In the final month of the session the Democratic record is being estimated throughout the length and breadth of the United States. Will they fulfill their promise?

Humanity, far more than politics, demands that the Kern-McGillivuddy bill be passed. The failure of our Federal government to compensate all of its injured employees, as is required of private employers in nearly every state, has long been a crying disgrace. The remedy offered is not a hasty makeshift, but a carefully considered, scientific bill.

JOHN B. ANDREWS.  
Secretary American Association for Labor Legislation.  
New York, July 18, 1916.